



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,311	03/26/2001	Barry Lynn Royer	2001P04780US	8865
7590 09/09/2004				
Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830			EXAMINER CALLAHAN, PAUL E	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/817,311	Applicant(s) ROYER ET AL.	
	Examiner Paul Callahan	Art Unit 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,11-13,16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3,9,10,14 and 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09042004</u> ✓ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application and have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: The preamble of the claim indicates that it is to be dependent on a parent claim. However, the number of the parent claim is missing. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claim contains the passage: "...for substantially randomly generating." It is unclear what is meant by "substantially" in this context.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 11, 12, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Bladow et al., US 6,115,040

As for claim 1, Bladow teaches a system employed by a first application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising: an entitlement processor for authorizing user access to said first application in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46); and a communication processor for communicating a session initiation request to a managing application to initiate generation of a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46).

As for claim 2 Bladow teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein said session initiation request to said managing application also initiates generation of an encryption key particular to said user initiated session for use by said first application. (col. 7 lines 30-45).

As for claim 4, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 1, wherein said communication processor also communicates additional parameters to said managing application for storage (col. 4 lines 1-2), said additional parameters including one or more of, (a) an authentication service identifier, (b) a language identifier, (c) a userid, (d) a URL for use in acquiring a web page providing a logon menu to support user initiation

of another session, (e) a URL to be contacted upon a predetermined event and (f) an identification of a type of said predetermined event (col. 4 lines 1-2).

As for claim 5, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 1, including an input processor for receiving said session identifier and an associated encryption key from said managing application (col. 7 lines 30-45).

As for claim 6, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 5, including an encryption processor for use in encrypting data associated with a personal record (col. 7 lines 30-45).

As for claim 7, Bladow teaches a system employed by a managing application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising: an input processor for receiving from a first application a session initiation request to initiate generation of a session identifier (col. 4 lines 1-12); a session identifier generator for generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session (col.3 lines 30-46); and a communication processor for, communicating said session identifier to said first application and communicating said session identifier to another application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to a request to receive said generated session identifier (col.3 lines 30-67, col. 4 lines 1-12).

As for claim 11, Bladow teaches a system supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising: a browser application providing a user interface display permitting user entry of identification

Art Unit: 2137

information and commands for a plurality of Internet compatible applications and for providing user identification information to a first application for validation (abstract, fig. 2 item 20: "Browser", fig. 4); and a managing application for generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session in response to receiving a session initiation request from a first application and for communicating said session identifier to said first application (col. 3 lines 1-21, 30-46).

As for claim 12, Bladow teaches a system according to claim 11, wherein said managing application also communicates to said first application data items including one or more of, (a) a key to be used in encrypting and decrypting a session identifier conveyed in URL data, (b) an indicator identifying whether or not a session initiation request is successful.

As for claim 16, Bladow teaches a method employed by a first application operating in a system supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of Internet compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), said method comprising the steps of: authorizing user access to said first application in response to validation of user identification information; and communicating a session initiation request to a managing application to initiate generation of a session identifier particular to a user initiated session in response to validation of user identification information (col. 3 lines 30-46).

As for claim 17, Bladow teaches a method employed by a managing application for supporting concurrent operation of a plurality of network compatible applications (col. 3 lines 1-21), comprising the steps of: receiving from a first application a session initiation request to initiate generation of a session identifier (col. 18 lines 12-65);

generating a session identifier particular to a user initiated session and for use by a plurality of concurrently operating applications to uniquely identify said user initiated session (col. 3 lines 30-46); and communicating said session identifier to said first application and to another application of said plurality of concurrently operating applications in response to a request to receive said generated session identifier (col. 18 lines 13-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow and Official Notice. Bladow teaches all of the limitations of claims 7 and 11 upon which claims 8 and 13 depend, but does not teach the feature of an encryption key generator for substantially randomly generating an encryption key particular to said user initiated session, in response to said session initiation request. However Official Notice may be taken that the use of a randomly generated key in session establishment protocols is a step that is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Bladow. The motive to make this combination is discussed by

Bladow in col. 7 lines 30-45 where the advantage of establishment of a secure session is discussed. Use of a randomly generated key would facilitate this secure session.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 3, 9, 10, 14, and 15 are object to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (703) 305-1336. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached on (703) 306-3036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

9/4/04

Paul Callahan